

Gaithersburg Day Laborer Task Force Meeting
March 14, 2006, 7:30 p.m.
Casey Community Center, Room A

I. Approval of Summary of 3/07/06 Meeting

A motion was made to approve the March 7, 2006 Day Laborer Task Force Meeting Summary. The motion passed.

II. Review List of Practical Options and Their Respective Pros and Cons

The task force was presented with a collective list of practical options and their respective pros and cons. Chair Prentiss Searles suggested the following method of voting in order to identify which of the 10 options the task force members felt were most important. Each task force member was given three votes. The votes could all be cast for the same option or for different options. The options garnering the most votes would become the starting point for the task force's recommendations.

Outcome of Vote:

<u>Option</u>	<u>Number of votes</u>
Option 1	22
Option 2	0
Option 3	11
Option 4	1
Option 5	0
Option 6	1
Option 7	1
Option 8	0
Option 9	0
Option 10	9

Based on the outcome of the vote, options 1, 3, and 10 were identified as the options that would form the basis for the task force's recommendations. Task force members were asked to review the chosen options and offer any additions/deletions/changes that would further strengthen their support of the chosen options.

Suggested changes to Option 1 were as follows:

- *Add* - Outdoor shelter and structure for office and classroom space
- *Add* - Full-time staffing (during hours of operation) with volunteers to supplement staff
- *Add* - Minimum size indoor/outdoor (Task force noted that it would be more appropriate to include this item in Charge #4)
- *Add* - Issue identification cards for laborers

- *Delete – #12* (Task Force agreed to reword.)
A discussion ensued in which some task force members supported deleting #12 and other members supported rewording #12. Primary concern focused on the foot traffic map which some viewed as a helpful tool and others viewed as directing people as to where they could and could not walk. A vote was taken and #12 was reworded.
- *Delete - #11* (Task Force agreed to delete.)
- *Add – Quarterly review to #10*
- *#7* (Task Force agreed to reword.)
Discussion ensued as to whether to offer English classes at the center. Subsequently, the board delved into a broader discussion regarding whether to offer social services as well. It was noted that the benefit to offering classes at the center was that people could take advantage of the location and audience. It was stressed that social services were available but day laborers and to some extent the greater community were not aware of them. It was suggested that this level of detail was more operational in nature, but that the one class that seemed logical to offer at the center was the English class. A vote was taken to reword #7 to include classes “at the center.”
- *#2* (Task Force agreed to reword.)
Concern was expressed in regard to who would run the center. As written, it appeared as though the center was being proposed to be run jointly by a faith-based organization and the City, which would be in conflict with #5 which states, “to allow a day laborer center to be opened and operated by others.”

In regard to the recommendation that the center be operated by a faith-based organization, it was noted that charities work best when they are local. Local faith-based organizations will know or get to know the community, its people and issues. National-based organizations may come in with standardized procedures that may not fully address local issues and may lack the personal connection to the community. One member disagreed with the recommendation that only a faith-based organization should be considered to run the center. Another member noted that these were all just recommendations and that the Mayor and Council could opt to mix and match criteria from the three identified options. Furthermore, it was recommended that the faith-based criteria not be included in Option 3 to further differentiate the options.

There were also differing views regarding the appropriateness of the City’s involvement with a proposed center. Some members believed that the City should be involved in a partnership with center operators as it was believed that the City would be held accountable and would be responsive to the community.

- *Add – Option 2 (#3) to Option 1 between (#2) and (#3).*
- *Add – Option 10 (#1) to Option 1.*

- *Add* – language to Option 1 and Option 3 urging “consideration of temporary location so services can be provided at the earliest possible time.”
- #3 (Task Force agreed to reword.)
- *Add* – #4 (after the existing sentence) “Create or modify existing anti-solicitation ordinances to accomplish this goal.”
- *Modify* – #9 replacing “worker” with “day laborer” and adding “in management of the organization.”
- *Add* – Options 3 (#5) to Option 1

As the review of Option 1 drew to a close, the assistance provided by Grace United Methodist Church was acknowledged and the need to formally thank them at the conclusion the process was noted. Chair Prentiss Searles noted that Option 1 would be modified to reflect the changes discussed at the meeting and a revision would be emailed to all task force members. They were encouraged to review the modified document in preparation for a vote and email any final changes to Prentiss.

Due to time constraints, review of Option 3 and Option 10 were deferred until next week. The task force discussed the process for voting on the options and the need to prioritize those options.

A motion was made to allow each member to vote on each option (either in “favor of” or “opposed to”) and to allow the resulting vote to automatically provide the information for ranking. The motion passed.

Absentee voting was also discussed and it was agreed that absentee voting could be done through email.

III. Review Work Plan for Remaining (2) Meetings

A. Dates for Presentation to Mayor and City Council

Assistant City Manager Tony Tomasello reported that the Task Force’s presentation to the Mayor and Council has been scheduled for Monday, April 10, 2006. The presentation would take the following form: The task force would make its presentation to the Mayor and City Council. Generally, 5 – 30 minutes would be allocated for presentations. The Council would then discuss the presentation. Public comment would follow the discussion with individuals given 3 minutes each in which to offer comments.

B. Reschedule March 21 Meeting

Chair Prentiss Searles noted that he was unable to make the March 21 meeting. Given the option of holding the meeting on March 21 or rescheduling for March 23, the task force voted (11 – 1) to reschedule the meeting for March 23, 2006. Cindy Hines stated that she will attempt to reschedule at the Casey Community Center and confirm with emails to all

task force members. Changes to meeting information would also be posted on the website.

IV. New Business

A. Dissenting Report

Daniel Muller presented a dissenting report corresponding to the Option B Final Report. The primary concerns/differences were summarized in the first paragraph. The document will be modified so that it is represented as a dissenting opinion to be incorporated in the Option B Final Research Report in accordance with the established process.

A task force member stated that if the dissenting opinion was included in the Option B Final Report that he was proposing a rebuttal be included as well. Tony Tomasello informed the task force that at a motion would need to be made to allow for a rebuttal and that a process would need to be created for a rebuttal, just as it had for the dissenting opinion.

V. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.